Remarks

This Amendment and Response herein is submitted concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination in response to the Advisory Action of December 15, 2008. Claims 1-8 and 14-26 were pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 14-26 stand rejected in the Office action dated September 3, 2008 (the "Office Action").

In this Response, claims 1, 8, 14, 21, 25 and 26 are amended without prejudice. Claims 6, 7 and 22 are canceled without prejudice. New claims 27 – 32 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments. Claims 1-5, 8, 14-21 and 22-32 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,625,169 ("Tofano") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,386,010 ("Solomon"), and in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0185221 ("Deikman"). Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected as purportedly being unpatentable over Tofano, Solomon, Deikman and U.S. Patent No. 5,490,292 ("Macera"). Claims 7 and 8 have been rejected as purportedly being unpatentable over Tofano, Solomon, Deikman and U.S. Patent No. 5,841,990 ("Picazo"). Claims 14, 15 and 18 – 20 have been rejected as purportedly being unpatentable over Tofano and Solomon. Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected as purportedly being unpatentable over Tofano, Solomon and Macera. Applicant traverses the rejections.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's assertion, with reference to former claim 7, that Tofano as modified by Solomon and as further modified by Deikman does not specifically disclose using a translation table to bridge between media channels.

As presently understood by the undersigned, Picazo generally relates to a packet switching machine that can include a forwarding table for forwarding from an incoming address

to a destination address. The forwarding table contains network addresses which contain entries for various network addresses indicating whether those addresses are on network 1 or network 2. Picazo, col. 8, ll. 13 – 20.

By contrast, amended independent claims 1, 14 and 21 include a "format translation table", "a plurality of mappings", and "a data structure", respectively, to translate among media formats for bridging packets between different channels. Amended independent claim 26 includes "selecting a mapping … to translate between heterogeneous media formats for use in bridging media transmissions between different media channels".

Picazo's table is only for the purpose of packet forwarding from an incoming address to a destination address. Picazo does not disclose or suggest a table or any other data structure for use in translating between packet *formats*. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Solomon, Tofano and Deikman do not disclose using a translation table to bridge between media channels.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Tofano, Solomon, Deikman and Picazo fail to teach or suggest each and every element of any of the independent claims. Therefore, claims 1, 14, 21 and 26, and their respective dependent claims are believed to allowable over the cited art. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections.

New Claims

New claims 27 – 32 have been added. Support for these claims can be found in the Application in at least paragraphs [0027] – [0029]. Because new claims 27 – 32 depend from independent claims which are believed to be allowable, claims 27 – 32 are believed to also be allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, claims 27 – 32 add further elements which Applicant believes are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. For example, in claims 27, 29 and 31, a metadata element and a packet format are used to identify a particular cell or mapping used for format translation.

Conclusion

Applicant has fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office Action and believes that claims 1-5, 8, 14-21 and 22-32 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should the Examiner maintain the current rejection, the undersigned has concurrently filed a Notice of Appeal herewith to preserve the Applicant's right to pursue an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney. If the Examiner believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Hamilton, DeSanctis & Cha LLP

By: /Michael A. DeSanctis/
         Michael A. DeSanctis, Esq.
         Reg. No. 39,957
         Customer No. 64128
         Ph: (303) 856-7155

Dated: January 24, 2009